



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,543	09/23/2003	Michael P. Wallace	03-398 (US01)	4647
41696 7590 12/18/2006 VISTA IP LAW GROUP LLP 12930 Saratoga Avenue Suite D-2 Saratoga, CA 95070			EXAMINER YABUT, DIANE D	
			ART UNIT 3734	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/18/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,543

Applicant(s)

WALLACE, MICHAEL P.

Examiner

Diane Yabut

Art Unit

3734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/23/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/23/03; 12/24/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 23 September 2003 and 24 December 2003 are acknowledged. The submissions are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 13, 18-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: On lines 4-5 of Claim 13 and on line 3 of Claim 18 it reads "portions of thereof" and should be changed to --portions thereof--. On line 7 of Claim 19 it reads "anuerysm" and should read --aneurysm--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 6-9, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**).

Art Unit: 3734

Claims 1-2 and 19: Engelson discloses deploying a vaso-occlusive device **220** at a target site comprising one of an aneurysm **200**, a blood vessel lumen, and a fistula in a vasculature of a body and delivering energy from a source outside the body to thereby heat the vaso-occlusive device at the target site, thereby heating blood or tissue in the aneurysm (Figures 10A-12C and col. 8, lines 11-67 to col. 9, lines 1-43).

Claims 6 and 22: Engelson discloses the source comprising a radio frequency device (col.1 , lines 4-17 and col. 6, lines 1-10).

Claims 7-9: Engelson discloses providing a bioactive agent carried by the vaso-occlusive device, wherein the bioactive agent is released and activated at the treatment site when the vaso-occlusive device is heated, the delivered heating energy causing a coating on the vaso-occlusive device to at least partially melt or soften, thereby releasing the bioactive agent (col. 9, lines 20-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 10, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**) in view of **Yamasaki** (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**).

Art Unit: 3734

Claim 3: Engelson discloses the claimed invention except for the source comprising a magnetic resonance device.

Yamasaki teaches a method and apparatus for aneurismal treatment using a heating source comprising a magnetic resonance device (page 7, paragraph 88). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a magnetic resonance device as a source, as taught by Yamasaki, to Engelson since it was known in the art that an MRI source yields higher temperature to effectively heat materials that are commonly used in vaso-occlusive devices that absorb MRI and radiofrequency energy.

Claim 10: Engelson discloses the claimed invention including deploying a vaso-occlusive device at a target site in a body and heating a highly resistive element in the vaso-occlusive device, except for positioning the body in a magnetic resonance imaging ("MRI") device, and activating the MRI device to apply a variable magnetic field to the body.

Yamasaki teaches for positioning the body in a magnetic resonance imaging ("MRI") device, and activating the MRI device to apply a variable magnetic field to the body, which would thereby heat a highly resistive element in the vaso-occlusive device (page 7, paragraph 88). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a magnetic resonance device as a source, as taught by Yamasaki, to Engelson since it was known in the art that an MRI source yields higher temperature to effectively heat materials that are commonly used in vaso-occlusive devices that absorb MRI and radiofrequency energy.

Art Unit: 3734

Claims 12-13: Engelson discloses the vaso-occlusive device being sufficiently heated by application of magnetic field energy to at least partially melt or soften a coating on the vaso-occlusive device, thereby releasing or activating a bioactive agent carried by the device and to at least partially melt and fuse together portions thereof to stabilize the vaso-occlusive device in the three-dimensional shape (col. 9, lines 20-37).

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**) and **Yamasaki** (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**), as applied to Claim 3 above, and further in view of **Ken** (U.S. Patent No. **5,853,418**).

Claim 4: Engelson and Yamasaki disclose the claimed invention except for the vaso-occlusive device comprising a ferrous material.

Ken teaches a vaso-occlusive device comprising a ferrous material which are very sturdy alloys and tolerate significant flexing (col. 4, lines 61-67 to col. 5, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a ferrous material for the vaso-occlusive device, as taught by Ken, to Engelson and Yamasaki in order for the device to tolerate significant flexing.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**), as applied to Claim 19 above, and further in view of **Ken** (U.S. Patent No. **5,853,418**).

Art Unit: 3734

Claim 20: Engelson discloses the claimed invention except for the vaso-occlusive device comprising a ferrous material.

Ken teaches a vaso-occlusive device comprising a ferrous material which are very sturdy alloys and tolerate significant flexing (col. 4, lines 61-67 to col. 5, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a ferrous material for the vaso-occlusive device, as taught by Ken, to Engelson in order for the device to tolerate significant flexing.

9. Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**) as applied to Claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of **Maitland** (U.S. Patent No. **6,740,094**).

Claims 5 and 21: Engelson discloses the claimed invention except for the source comprising an ultrasound device acoustically coupled to an exterior of the body.

Maitland teaches a source comprising an ultrasound device acoustically coupled to an exterior of a body, which allows for both local or remote heating (col. 6, lines 26-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide an ultrasound device source, as taught by Maitland, to Engelson in order to allow for both local or remote heating and since it was known in the art that acoustic/ultrasound waves effectively heat materials that are commonly used in vaso-occlusive devices that absorb ultrasonic energy.

Art Unit: 3734

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**) and **Yamasaki** (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**), as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of **Lennox** (U.S. Patent No. **5,405,322**).

Claim 11: Engelson and Yamasaki disclose the claimed invention including being heated by application of magnetic field energy, except for being sufficiently heated to cause coagulation of blood at the target site.

Lennox teaches a method for treating aneurysms using a thermal source for a body to be sufficiently heated to cause coagulation of blood at the target site in order to form fibrous scar tissue in the weakened aneurysm wall and reduces compliance and arrest aneurysm formation (col. 4, lines 13-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide heat to cause coagulation of blood at the target site, as taught by Lennox, to Engelson and Yamasaki in order to form fibrous scar tissue in the weakened aneurysm wall and reduces compliance and arrest aneurysm formation.

11. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ken** (U.S. Patent No. **5,853,418**) in view of **Yamasaki** (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**).

Claims 14-15: Ken discloses the claimed invention, including deploying a vaso-occlusive device **318** in an aneurysm **314**, the device including a highly conductive coil forming a lumen and formed of platinum, and a highly resistive element at least partially disposed in the lumen and comprising ferrous

Art Unit: 3734

(containing iron) material and heating the highly resistive element, and, by way of convective heat transfer from the highly resistive element, heating the coil (Figures 11A-11D, col. 4, lines 47-67 to col. 5, lines 1-10, col. 9, lines 16-43), except for applying magnetic field energy to the device from a source located outside of the body.

Yamasaki teaches applying magnetic field energy to a device from a source located outside of the body (page 7, paragraph 88). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a magnetic resonance device as a source, as taught by Yamasaki, to Ken since it was known in the art that an MRI source yields higher temperature to effectively heat materials that are commonly used in vaso-occlusive devices that absorb MRI and radiofrequency energy.

12. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ken (U.S. Patent No. **5,853,418**) and Yamasaki (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**), as applied to Claim 14 above, and further in view of Lennox (U.S. Patent No. **5,405,322**).

Claim 16: Ken and Yamasaki disclose the claimed device except for the coil being sufficiently heated to cause blood coagulation in the aneurysm.

Lennox teaches a method for treating aneurysms using a thermal source for a body to be sufficiently heated to cause coagulation of blood at the target site in order to form fibrous scar tissue in the weakened aneurysm wall and reduces compliance and arrest aneurysm formation (col. 4, lines 13-25). It would have

Art Unit: 3734

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide heat to cause coagulation of blood at the target site, as taught by Lennox, to Ken and Yamasaki in order to form fibrous scar tissue in the weakened aneurysm wall and reduces compliance and arrest aneurysm formation.

13. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ken** (U.S. Patent No. **5,853,418**) and **Yamasaki** (U.S. Pub. No. **20040215124**), as applied to Claim 14, and further in view of **Engelson** (U.S. Patent No. **5,749,894**).

Claims 17-18: Ken and Yamasaki disclose the claimed device including the coil being deployed in the aneurysm in a three-dimensional shape, except for the coil being sufficiently heated to at least partially melt or soften a coating on the coil, thereby releasing or activating a bioactive agent, and at least partially melting and fusing together portions thereof to stabilize the coil in the three-dimensional shape.

Engelson teaches a coil being sufficiently heated to at least partially melt or soften a coating on the coil, thereby releasing or activating a bioactive agent, and at least partially melting and fusing together portions thereof to stabilize the coil in the three-dimensional shape (col. 9, lines 20-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Ken and Yamasaki by providing the melting of a coating on the coil to release or activate a bioactive agent, as taught by Engelson, since it was known in the art

Art Unit: 3734

that bioactive agents may have beneficial antimicrobial, anti-cancer, or antiviral effects which are commonly released or activated by heat.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diane Yabut whose telephone number is (571) 272-6831. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 9AM-4PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3734

DY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M J Hayes". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

MICHAEL J. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER